

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Final Office Action dated March 29, 2011 and the Advisory Action dated August 30, 2011. A Request for Continued Examination is submitted herewith. A Petition for a One Month Extension of Time is also submitted herewith. Applicants note that only a one month extension is needed because the period of reply expired on the mailing date of the Advisory Action, August 30, 2011.

Claims 29-35, 62, and 64 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-18, 21-28, and 41-60 stand previously canceled. Claims 19, 20, 36-40, 61, and 63 stand previously withdrawn. In this Response, Claim 29 is amended, and Claims 65 and 66 are newly added. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected:

- i. Claims 29-31, 33-35, and 62 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2004/0105641 to Lewis ("Lewis") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,216,227 to Goldstein et al. ("Goldstein"), and further in view of U.S. Publication 2009/0125429 to Takayama ("Takayama"); and
- ii. Claim 64 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis, in view of Goldstein and Takayama, and further in view of U.S. Patent 7,392,226 to Sasaki et al. ("Sasaki").

At least in view of the amendments, Applicants respectfully disagree with and traverse these rejections.

Independent Claim 29

Independent Claim 29 has been amended to recite, in part, "wherein the first information storage chip is mounted on a first portable device that performs non-contact communication, and the second information storage chip is mounted on a second portable device that performs non-contact communication." The amendment is fully supported by the specification. For example, see at least paragraph [0119] of the published specification.

Applicants respectfully submit the cited prior art is silent regarding "wherein the first information storage chip is mounted on a first portable device that performs non-contact

communication, and the second information storage chip is mounted on a second portable device that performs 'non-contact communication' as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the obviousness rejections with respect to independent Claim 29, and the claims that depend thereon, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Dependent Claim 64

Regarding dependent Claim 64, the Advisory Action failed to respond to Applicants' argument made in the Response dated May 23, 2011 that Sasaki teaches away from using IDs and passwords. See Response dated May 23, 2011, p. 12. Instead, the Advisory Action maintained the position that Sasaki teaches the claimed identification information and password and stated:

Examiner interprets that since Sasaki discloses that the electronic ticket contains a "certificate" describing identification information so a user need not enter the ID or password each time, *this suggests that a user ID and password is associated with the processes* involved concerning the electronic ticket...

Advisory Action, p. 2 (emphasis added).

As previously argued, Sasaki describes related art that uses IDs and passwords in electronic ticket systems. Col. 2, lines 1-24. Sasaki criticizes these systems and lists several problems with using IDs and passwords. Col. 2, lines 23-44. For example, "the service provider needs to provide a database, etc., for managing information of the registered membership IDs, passwords, etc., and thus must bear the high administration cost." Col. 2, lines 37-40. In view of these problems, Sasaki replaces the IDs and passwords with a "network electronic ticket" that is stored in the user's network-linked electronic ticket.

Thus, the personal consumer need not register his or her ID or password for the provider and need not enter the ID or password each time and safety is enhanced and the convenience of the personal consumer is also improved. The service provider need not provide a database for managing the information of the registered membership IDs, passwords, etc., and the costs of the entire system can be reduced.

Col. 30, lines 15-22. Thus, Sasaki discloses that IDs and passwords are not entered, and that no database is provided to manage IDs and passwords. Therefore, Sasaki specifically criticizes,

discredits, and replaces the use of IDs and passwords, and does not suggest "a user ID and password is associated with the process" as the Patent Office alleged.

If the Patent Office maintains the position that Sasaki suggests "a user ID and password is associated with the process," Applicants respectfully request the Patent Office explain how a user ID and password are associated with the process, how they are used and maintained, and why one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to use the criticized user ID and password.

New Claims

Applicants note that Claims 65 and 66 are newly added and are fully supported by the specification. For example, see paragraph [0268]-[0277] of the published specification stating.

Applicants respectfully submit that the subject matter as defined in the newly added claims is patentable over the cited art of record for at least the same reasons as discussed above, and for the additional patentable elements recited therein.

Conclusion

An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for formal allowance, and allowance is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this Response, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner contact the undersigned.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Respectfully submitted,

K&L GATES LLP

BY 

Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
Customer No. 29175
Phone: 312-807-4310

Dated: September 28, 2011